



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,727	12/11/2003	Kenneth L. Addy	H0006399/4874/107934	8574
92556	7590	03/22/2010		
HONEYWELL/HUSCH Patent Services 101 Columbia Road P.O.Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962			EXAMINER DIEP, NHON THANH	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/22/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentservices-us@honeywell.com  
pmvdocket@welshkatz.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/733,727

**Applicant(s)**

ADDY, KENNETH L.

**Examiner**

Nhon T. Diep

**Art Unit**

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3/4/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regard to the applicants' argument that: "As such, neither Kanayama et al. or Smart or the combination of Kanayama et al. and Smart provide any teaching or suggestion of the context "wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to transmit an RF security/alarm event message to the security system cameras which causes the security system video cameras to awaken from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode."

The examiner respectfully disagrees, since Kanayama et al, paragraph 0104 shows the trespasser sensor 12b is activated around the clock; upon detection of an abnormality, it sends a detection signal to the sensor control section 21 to request that the security camera 12a start operating and further more, paragraph 0060 shows "FIG. 1 shows, as examples of the sensors 12, a sensor 12a which is a security camera and a sensor 12b which is an infrared trespasser sensor. The sensors 12a and 12b are mere examples. The sensors 12 may be any of the sensors in the above listing. Moreover, Besides, although FIG. 1 shows only the sensor 12a and the sensor 12b provided in the local security system 3, many more sensors 12 may be provided in practice. And, therefore, it meets the newly amended limitation of "to the security cameras".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanayama et al (cited in the previous Office Action), in view of Stuart (US 7,012,523 B2).

Kanayama et al discloses an information processing system comprising the same security system comprising:

a plurality of security video cameras (paragraphs 0060 and fig. 2, el. 12), each having an RF receiver (paragraph 0082) and operating in a standby inactive video mode, providing a low electrical power consumption, or in an active video recording mode that consumes a greater amount of electrical power (paragraph 0104: The trespasser sensor 12b is activated around the clock; upon detection of an abnormality, it sends a detection signal to the sensor control section 21 to request that the security camera 12a start operating);

a plurality of security sensors for detecting a security/alarm event, each located elsewhere with respect to the plurality of video cameras and each having an RF transmitter for transmitting an RF security/alarm event message indicating detection of a security/alarm event (paragraphs 0104-0105);

wherein an alarm event detected by a security sensor of the security system causes the security sensor to transmit an RF security/alarm event message to the

security cameras which causes the security system video cameras to awaken from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode (paragraphs 0104-0105: The examiner considers that security camera has at least two states; non-operating = stand-by or inactive mode, and operating stats = active mode) as specified in claims 1 and 11; wherein each security video camera awakens from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode for a predetermined period of time (paragraphs 0104-0105) as specified in claims 2 and 12; wherein each security video camera is awakened from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode by a security/alarm event message received from a security sensor (paragraphs 0104-0105) as specified in claims 3 and 13; wherein each security video camera is always switched from the standby inactive video mode to the active video recording mode by an RF security/alarm event message from a security sensor (paragraphs 0104-0105) as specified in claims 4 and 14; wherein the security system includes a security system control panel which has an armed state in which the security system is armed and a disarmed state in which the security system is disarmed, and the security system control panel sends an RF enable message, enabling each security video camera to be awakened from the standby inactive video mode into the active video recording mode by a security/alarm event message received from a security sensor, if the security system control panel is in an armed state (fig. 9. el. S201-S211-S202-S213-S221-... ) as specified in claims 5-7 and 15-17; wherein the security system control panel has an armed state in which the security system is armed and a disarmed state in which the security system is disarmed, and the security system control panel

sends an RF awoken message to the security video cameras if the security system control panel is in an armed state and does not send the RF awoken message to the security video cameras if the security system control panel is in a disarmed state (paragraph 0069: processing starts when the user gives an instruction to start monitoring a monitoring = armed state and when the user does not give an instruction to start monitoring, nothing will happen) as specified in claims 8 and 18. It is noted that Kanayama et al does not particularly disclose security cameras are battery operated video cameras as specified in claims 1 and 11. Stuart teaches "The surveillance system can include, if desired, a telephone, a battery to operate the camera, a remote unit to receive the transmitter signal and store data in the signal, or a remote unit to receive the signal and activate an electrically powered unit operatively associated with the surveillance system. The battery can be powered by electricity from a phone line, as can be the electrically powered units operatively associated with the surveillance system". And, therefore, it is considered to be obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine all claimed elements by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skilled in the art. Doing so would help to eliminate the need of the connection to power lines.

Regarding to claims 9-10 and 19-20: The examiner takes Official Notice that a security video camera which includes a video storage buffer memory local to the security video camera; and wherein the security system includes a remote video storage memory remote to each security video camera, and upon activation each video

security camera transmits video data to the remote video storage memory are well known in the art; and therefore, it is considered to be obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine all claimed elements by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skilled in the art. Doing so would help to store captured video images for later review.

***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon T. Diep whose telephone number is 571-272-7328. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nhon T Diep/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621